



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,597	11/08/2001	Behzad Boroumand	118-2.1	2465
7590	04/08/2005		EXAMINER	
Dinh & Associates Truong Dinh 2506 Ash Street Palo Alto, CA 94306			DALENCOURT, YVES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/008,597	BOROUMAND ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Yves Dalencourt	2157	

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed on 11/08/01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 - 3, 12 - 21, 26, and 30 - 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being obvious over D'Souza et al (US2002/0156870; hereinafter D'Souza).

Regarding claim 1, D'Souza teaches a method of invoking an application to process a multimedia resource specified by a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (figs. 3 - 6; col. 3, lines 32 – 49; col. 5, lines 7 - 16), the method comprising the steps of mapping a set of keys on a user device to a set of URLs (col. 4, lines 40 – 50; col. 5, lines 33 – 34 and 56 - 63; D'Souza discloses wherein an array of key is configured to allow a user to program desired site addresses (URL); detecting activation of a particular mapped key (col. 5, lines 28 – 37; col. 6, lines 31 – 43; D'Souza discloses that rapid Internet access functions executed in response to actuation or closure of switches, 82, 84, 86, and 88 may be accomplished through actuation of a combination of switches on the

keyboard, where the actuation of this key causes a high-level interrupt for opening or launching); retrieving a URL associated with the activated mapped key (col. 5, line 54 through col. 6, line 7; col. 6, lines 43 – 48; col. 7, lines 2 – 13; D'Souza discloses that a user may navigate directly to the Internet sites, perform electronic commerce, access electronic messages, and so forth upon depression of the specialized function key and one or more additional keys); and invoking an application to process the media resource specified by the retrieved URL (134, fig. 6; col. 5, lines 34 – 40, lines 50 – 53, lines 65 – 67; col. 7, lines 16 – 66; D'Souza discloses that once scan code from the keyboard has been identified as corresponding to actuation of one of the rapid Internet access keys, the message is passed to CPU 28 for execution of application software code as indicated at step 134).

Regarding claim 2, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the retrieved URL is a resource on a server designated to process requests generated in response to activation of any one of the mapped keys (col. 5, lines 56 – 63; D'Souza discloses that one or more keys may also be user configurable to allow a user to program desired site addresses by storing code representative of a corresponding universal resource locator (URL) in the memory circuitry of the computer system).

Regarding claim 3, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 1, which further comprising the steps of accessing a particular Web page having a link for a setup program (col. 5, lines 33 – 36; col. 6, lines 55 – 58); downloading the setup program onto the user device (col. 5, lines 33 – 38); and executing the setup program to assist with the mapping of the set of keys (col. 5, lines 35 – 38); D'Souza discloses that

functions keys 70 are provided for executing predetermined functions based upon a particular software application being run on the computer system).

Regarding claim 12, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 1, which further comprises the steps of receiving a first indication to disable the set of mapped keys (col. 5, lines 65 – 67 by reconfiguring the array of keys to access sites of other type of interest to the user); and disabling the set of mapped keys in response to the received first indication (col. 5, lines 65 – 67 by reconfiguring the array of keys to access sites of other type of interest to the user).

Regarding claim 13, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 12, which further comprises the steps of receiving a second indication to enable the set of mapped keys (col. 5, lines 8 – 15); and enabling the set of mapped keys in response to the received second indication (col. 5, lines 8 – 15; D'Souza discloses that keyboard 16 is configured as a specially adapted, general purpose keyboard including a standard key array 86 for performing text editing functions and inputting data in a conventional manner).

Regarding claim 14, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the set of mapped keys are selected from a set of functional (F) keys available on a computer keyboard (68, fig. 3; col. 5, lines 7 – 16).

Regarding claim 15, D'Souza teaches method for mapping a set of keys on a user device to a set of Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) (fig. 3; col. 3, lines 32 – 49), the method comprising the steps of associating each key in a first set of keys with a respective set of one or more URLs (col. 5, lines 33 – 34; D'Souza discloses that a series of dedicated keys are also provided in a designated rapid Internet access array

78); and for each of one or more keys in the first set, receiving a selection for a particular URL in the associated set of URLs (col. 5, lines 34 – 44; D'Souza discloses that the array includes dedicated keys for rapidly accessing specific sites on the Internet), and mapping the key to the selected URL (col. 4, lines 40 – 50; col. 5, lines 17 – 33; D'Souza discloses a keyboard 16 that includes an array of dedicated keys for rapidly accessing specific sites on the Internet).

Regarding claim 16, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 15, which further comprising the step of associating each key in a second set of one or more keys with a respective URL (76, fig. 3; col. 5, lines 27 – 33; D'Souza discloses an application launch key 76 that causes a high-level interrupt for opening or launching a specific user-configurable software application, such as a text editing application).

Regarding claim 17, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 15, which further comprising the steps of associating each key in a third set of one or more keys with an unrestricted URL (78, fig. 3; col. 5, lines 33 - 63); and for each of one or more keys in the third set, receiving an entry for a particular URL, and mapping the key to the entered URL (col. 5, lines 63 – 67; D'Souza discloses keys 82, 84, 86, and 88 are provided for specific types of Internet sites and applications, where desired these keys may be reconfigurable to access sites of other types of interest to the user).

Regarding claim 18, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 15, which further comprising the steps of storing the URL for each mapped key to a storage unit (col. 5, lines 56 – 63; col. 7, lines 56 – 60; D'Souza discloses that URL addresses for these

sites are preferably stored in the memory circuitry of the computer system and are accessed at step 146 during navigation to the site).

Regarding claim 19, D'Souza teaches a method for processing HTTP requests at a first server fig. 6), the method comprising the steps of receiving an HTTP request from a user device, wherein the request includes a unique identification code and an identifier for a particular key activated to generate the request (col. 5, lines 17 – 33; col. 8, lines 10 – 34; D'Souza discloses a keyboard 16 that includes an array of dedicated keys for rapidly accessing specific sites on the Internet); determining a multimedia resource location for the activated key (col. 5, line 54 through col. 6, line 7; col. 6, lines 43 – 48; D'Souza discloses that a user may navigate directly to the Internet sites, perform electronic commerce, access electronic messages, and so forth upon depression of the specialized function key and one or more additional keys); and directing the received request to the determined resource address for the activated key (134, fig. 6; col. 5, lines 33 – 40; col. 7, lines 16 – 66; D'Souza discloses that once scan code from the keyboard has been identified as corresponding to actuation of one of the rapid Internet access keys, the message is passed to CPU 28 for execution of application software code as indicated at step 134).

Regarding claim 20, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 19, wherein the resource address for the activated key is determined based on the unique identification code and the identity of the activated key (col. 7, lines 60 trough col. 8, line 8' D'Souza discloses that upon actuation of key 82, CPU 28 reads a stored address for a default site from the memory circuit and accesses the site. When the user is already operating

in a browser, and logged onto the network, actuation of a different key results in navigation to the corresponding other Internet site at step 146).

Regarding claim 21, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 19, wherein the resource address for the activated key is retrieved from a database used to store resource addresses for unique identification codes and keys (col. 7, lines 60 through col. 8, line 8' D'Souza discloses that upon actuation of key 82, CPU 28 reads a stored address for a default site from the memory circuit and accesses the site. When the user is already operating in a browser, and logged onto the network, actuation of a different key results in navigation to the corresponding other Internet site at step 146).

Regarding claim 26, D'Souza teaches the method of claim 19, the method of claim 19, which further comprises the step of initiating a setup program if the unique identification code or identity of the activated key is unrecognized (col. 7, lines 16 – 36; D'Souza discloses that CPU 28 then determines whether the corresponding application required for execution of the keystroke command has been launched as shown at step 138. If CPU determines that the application has not been launched, control proceeds to step 140 wherein executable commands stored in memory circuit 30 are processed to load application configuration and launch the program).

Regarding claim 30, D'Souza teaches a computer program product for directing an application to a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (figs. 3 - 6; col. 3, lines 32 – 49; col. 5, lines 7 - 16), comprising: code that maps a set of keys on a user device to a set of URLs (col. 4, lines 40 – 50; col. 5, lines 17 – 33; D'Souza discloses a keyboard 16 that includes an array of dedicated keys for rapidly accessing specific sites on the

Internet); code that detects activation of a particular mapped key (col. 4, lines 50 – 54; col. 6, lines 31 – 43; D'Souza discloses that rapid Internet access functions executed in response to actuation or closure of switches 82, 84, 86, and 88 may be accomplished through actuation of a combination of switches on the keyboard); code that retrieves a URL associated with the activated mapped key (col. 5, line 54 through col. 6, line 7; col. 6, lines 43 – 48; D'Souza discloses that a user may navigate directly to the Internet sites, perform electronic commerce, access electronic messages, and so forth upon depression of the specialized function key and one or more additional keys); code that directs the application to the retrieved URL, wherein the application is a Web browser or a multimedia player (134, fig. 6; col. 5, lines 33 – 40; col. 7, lines 16 – 66; D'Souza discloses that once scan code from the keyboard has been identified as corresponding to actuation of one of the rapid Internet access keys, the message is passed to CPU 28 for execution of application software code as indicated at step 134); and a data storage medium operative to store the codes (col. 5, lines 56 – 63; col. 7, lines 56 – 60; D'Souza discloses that URL addresses for these sites are preferably stored in the memory circuitry of the computer system and are accessed at step 146 during navigation to the site).

Regarding claim 31, D'Souza teaches server operative to process HTTP requests and comprising a data storage medium configured to store a handler module operable to receive a request from a user device (col. 5, lines 56 – 63; col. 7, lines 56 – 60; D'Souza discloses that URL addresses for these sites are preferably stored in the memory circuitry of the computer system and are accessed at step 146 during

navigation to the site), wherein the request includes a unique identification code and an identifier for a particular key activated to generate the request (col. 4, lines 50 – 54; col. 6, lines 31 – 43; D'Souza discloses that rapid Internet access functions executed in response to actuation or closure of switches 82, 84, 86, and 88 may be accomplished through actuation of a combination of switches on the keyboard), determine a multimedia resource address for the activated key, and direct the received request to the determined resource address for the activated key (col. 5, line 54 through col. 6, line 7; col. 6, lines 43 – 48; D'Souza discloses that a user may navigate directly to the Internet sites, perform electronic commerce, access electronic messages, and so forth upon depression of the specialized function key and one or more additional keys); and at least one processor operatively coupled to the data storage medium and configured to execute the one or more modules stored therein (28, fig. 2; col. 5, lines 33 – 40; col. 7, lines 16 – 66; D'Souza discloses that once scan code from the keyboard has been identified as corresponding to actuation of one of the rapid Internet access keys, the message is passed to CPU 28 for execution of application software code as indicated at step 134).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 4 – 11 and 22 – 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D’Souza et al (US2002/0156870; hereinafter D’Souza) in view of Durst et al (US 6,108,656; hereinafter Durst).

Regarding claims 4, 22, and 24, D’Souza substantially teaches all the limitations in claims 1 and 19, including the idea of reconfiguring these keys to access sites of other types of interest to the user (col. 5, lines 65 – 67), but fails to specifically teach the step of obtaining demographic data and descriptive information for a user of the user device

However, Durst teaches, in an analogous art, an automatically access of electronic information through machine-readable codes on printed documents, which comprises the step of obtaining demographic data for a user of the user device (col. 8, lines 41 - 45); generating a unique identification code for the user; and wherein the

unique identification code is generated based on the supplied demographic data for the user (col. 8, lines 18 – 32).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify D'Souza's system and method by incorporating the use of obtaining demographic data for a user of the user device as evidenced by Durst for the purpose of securing data transmissions, so that user(s) would have confidence in the system and thus send sensitive information; thereby, enabling electronic commerce to flourish well beyond the point it exists today.

Regarding claims 5 - 6, and 23, D'Souza substantially teaches all the limitations in claims 4 and 22, but fails to specifically teach the step of generating a unique identification code for the user (claim 5); and wherein the unique identification code is generated based on the supplied demographic data for the user (claims 6 and 23).

However, Durst teaches, in an analogous art, an automatically access of electronic information through machine-readable codes on printed documents, which comprises the step of generating a unique identification code for the user (col. 8, lines 18 – 32); and wherein the unique identification code is generated based on the supplied demographic data for the user (col. 8, lines 41 - 45).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify D'Souza's system and method by incorporating the use of generating a unique identification code for the user; and wherein the unique identification code is generated based on the supplied demographic data for the user as evidenced by Durst for the purpose of securing data transmissions, so that user(s)

would have confidence in the system and thus send sensitive information; thereby, enabling electronic commerce to flourish well beyond the point it exists today.

Regarding claim 8, D'Souza and Durst teach all the limitations in claim 5, and D'Souza further teaches that the directing the Web page includes generating an application invocation request, using the HTTP protocol, for the activated mapped key, wherein the request includes the URL associated with the activated mapped key and the unique identification code (col. 5, lines 41 – 53; D'Souza discloses an Internet log-on key 82 for executing an Internet web browser application. Applicant(s) should duly note that HTTP is a protocol that allows users to access information over the World Wide Web).

Regarding claim 9, D'Souza and Durst teach all the limitations in claim 8, and D'Souza further teaches the step of sending the HTTP request to a server designated by the URL (col. 5, lines 49 – 63; D'Souza discloses that an electronic messaging key 88 is provided for launching an electronic messaging application and for contacting a desired electronic messaging server).

Regarding claim 10, D'Souza and Durst teach all the limitations in claim 8, and D'Souza further teaches the step of processing the request local to the client system (col. 6, lines 43 – 46; D'Souza discloses that a user may navigate directly to Internet sites, perform electronic commerce accessing electronic messages, and so forth upon depression of the specialized function key and one or more additional keys).

Regarding claim 11, D'Souza and Durst teach all the limitations in claim 8, and D'Souza further teaches that the HTTP request further includes an identifier for the

activated mapped key (col. 7, lines 4 – 36; D'Souza discloses that once scan code from the keyboard has been identified as corresponding to actuation of one of the rapid Internet access keys, the message is passed to CPU 28 for execution of application software code as indicated in step 134).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Souza et al (US2002/0156870; hereinafter D'Souza) in view of Durst et al (US 6,108,656; hereinafter Durst), and further in view of Raley et al (US 2003/0204753; hereinafter Raley).

Regarding claim 7, D'Souza and Durst teach all the limitations in claim 6, but fail to specifically teach that the unique identification code is further generated based on a pseudo-random number.

However, Raley teaches, in an analogous art, a method and apparatus for dynamic protection of static and dynamic content, wherein the unique identification code is further generated based on a pseudo-random number (paragraph 0087).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of D'Souza and Durst by incorporating a unique identification code generated based on a pseudo-random number as evidenced by Raley for the purpose of increasing security, thereby, providing integrity and reliability to the system and method.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Souza et al (US2002/0156870; hereinafter D'Souza) in view of Durst et al (US 6,108,656; hereinafter Durst), and further in view of Boyd et al (US 6,360,261; hereinafter Boyd).

Regarding claim 25, D'Souza and Durst teach all the limitations in claim 24, but fail to specifically teach that the descriptive information includes a particular time of day the request was received.

However, Boyd teaches, in an analogous art, a system and method for analyzing remote traffic data in distributed computing environment, wherein the descriptive information includes a particular time of day the request was received (col. 6, lines 17 – 45; col. 8, lines 11 – 17; Boyd discloses that the access information included contextual information derived from the hit, such as the particular web page accessed, the day of the week, the hour of the day and so forth).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined D'Souza and Durst's system and method by including in the descriptive information a particular time of day the request was received as evidenced by Boyd for the purpose of analyzing remote traffic data in a distributed computing environment in timely and accurate manner, thereby providing useful statistical information in tailoring marketing or managerial strategies to better match the apparent need of the user(s).

Claims 27 – 29, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Souza et al (US2002/0156870; hereinafter D'Souza) in view of Mangipudi et al (US 6,728,748; hereinafter Mangipudi).

Regarding claim 27, D'Souza teaches all the limitations in claim 19, but fails to specifically teach the steps of determining a load at the first server; and directing the received request to a second server if the load at the server is above a particular threshold.

However, Mangipudi teaches, in an analogous art, a method and apparatus for policy based class of service and adaptive service level management within the content of an Internet and Intranet, which comprises teach the steps of determining a load at the first server (fig. 3; col. 7, lines 56 – 64; col. 10, lines 10 – 28; Mangipudi discloses that the specific back-end server machine selected for a classified request will depend upon the load balancing algorithm defined for the cluster or class assigned to the request); and directing the received request to a second server if the load at the server is above a particular threshold (col. 10, lines 28 – 60; col. 10, line 61 through col. 11, line 6; Mangipudi discloses that once the number of predetermined connection is exceeded, the system redirects requests to another server with fewer connections).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify D'Souza's system by utilizing a load balancing algorithm among servers in a cluster as evidenced by Mangipudi for the purpose of avoiding imbalance of load among members of a cluster, thereby preventing server bottlenecks and breakdowns.

Regarding claims 28, 29, and 33 D'Souza teaches all the limitations in claims 19 and 31, but fails to specifically teach the steps of identifying the number of servers available to process requests; computing a code for the received request; and directing

the received request to one of the available servers based on the computed code (claim 28); and wherein the computed code is based on at least a portion of the unique identification code included in the received request (claim 29).

However, Mangipudi teaches, in an analogous art, a method and apparatus for policy based class of service and adaptive service level management within the content of an Internet and Intranet, which comprises the steps of identifying the number of servers available to process requests (col. 7, lines 60 – 65; Mangipudi discloses a monitoring processor adaptive policy engine 210, in communication with the router dynamically monitors workload and availability of servers to enable requests to be sent to the most appropriate and optimal server); computing a code for the received request (col. 7, lines 5 – 15, lines 42 – 50; Mangipudi discloses that grouping service hosts into clusters, along with recognizing and categorizing traffic based upon their domain of origin, URL, transactions, service or protocol, source or destination IP address, virtual site, or based upon authenticated user name as described hereinafter); and directing the received request to one of the available servers based on the computed code (col. 7, lines 40 – 41; Mangipudi discloses that client requests are then directed to a specific cluster that provides preferential and differential service); and wherein the computed code is based on at least a portion of the unique identification code included in the received request (col. 9, lines 29 – 51).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify D'Souza's system by utilizing a load balancing algorithm among servers in a cluster as evidenced by Mangipudi for the purpose of enabling

requests to be sent to the most appropriate and optimal server, thereby maintaining consistent response times and service level commitments even with increases in traffic and processing loads.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Souza et al (US2002/0156870; hereinafter D'Souza) in view of Boyd et al (US 6,360,261; hereinafter Boyd).

Regarding claim 32, D'Souza teaches all the limitations in claim 31, including the step of collecting an identity of the particular key activated to generate the received request (col. 4, lines 47 – 50; col. 5, lines 17 – 33; D'Souza discloses a keyboard 16 that includes an array of dedicated keys for rapidly accessing specific sites on the Internet), but fails to specifically teach the steps of collecting demographic information associated with the received request; and collecting information relating to a particular time of day the request was received.

However, Boyd teaches, in an analogous art, a system and method for analyzing remote traffic data in distributed computing environment, which comprises the steps of collecting demographic information associated with the received request (col. 4, lines 47 – 52; col. 6, lines 56 – 66; Boyd discloses that each table stores a particular type of access information, such as the state, city or country of the user); and collecting information relating to a particular time of day the request was received (col. 6, lines 17 – 45; col. 8, lines 11 – 17; Boyd discloses that the access information included contextual information derived from the hit, such as the particular web page accessed, the day of the week, the hour of the day and so forth).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify D'Souza's system and method by incorporating the steps of collecting demographic information associated with the received request; and collecting information relating to a particular time of day the request was received as evidenced by Boyd for the purpose of analyzing remote traffic data in a distributed computing environment in timely and accurate manner, thereby, providing useful statistical information in tailoring marketing or managerial strategies to better match the apparent need of the user(s).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Emens et al (US Patent Number 6,564,257) discloses a repository protection by URL expiration.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yves Dalencourt whose telephone number is (571) 272-3998. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30AM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yves Dalencourt

March 16, 2005